

REMARKS

Applicants request favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 29-31 are pending in this application, with Claim 29 being the sole independent claim.

Claims 29-31 have been amended. Applicants submit that support for these amendments can be found in the original disclosure at least in Fig. 1 and the corresponding description at page 7, lines 4-11 and page 13, lines 8-27 of the specification, for example. Therefore, Applicants submit that no new matter has been added.

The Examiner objected to the Amendment filed on December 13, 2004 as allegedly introducing new matter, and she rejected Claims 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement and for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims have been amended in view of the Examiner's comments and, as specified above, support for the amended claims can be found in the original disclosure. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the basis for the objection to new matter and the rejection under Section 112, first paragraph, as been addressed, and withdrawal of that objection and rejection are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has objected to Claims 29-31 due to informalities, as discussed at pages 4-5 of the Office Action. The claims have been amended in view of the Examiner's comments, and Applicants believe that those amendments overcome the noted informalities. (Applicants submit that the amendments to Claim 31 are supported at least

by Fig. 3 and the corresponding description at page 18, lines 7-15, for example.)

Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of these objections to the claims.

Claims 29-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,703,717 (Ezra et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,663,831 (Mashitani et al.). The Examiner commented in the Office Action that certain features could not be examined because they were not supported by the specification. In view of the amendments to address the Section 112, first paragraph rejections, and in light of the Examiner's statement regarding allowable subject matter, Applicants submit that the cited art fails to disclose or suggest the features of the amended claims, and that those claims are patentable over the cited art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 29-31 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double-patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 39-41 of copending Appln. No. 09/836,368 ("the '368 application"). Since this is a provisional rejection, Applicants request that it be withdrawn and that this application be passed to issue. In any event, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

As recited in independent Claim 29 of the present invention, a stereoscopic image display apparatus allows an observer to observe a stereoscopic image by providing an image display element that displays a synthesized parallax image by alternately arranging stripe images for a left eye and stripe images for a right eye in a vertical direction, providing a mask member including a plurality of openings and a plurality of

shield regions, and first and second optical systems. The second optical system includes a first lens array having a plurality of lenticular lenses periodically arranged in a vertical direction and a second lens array having a plurality of lenticular lenses periodically arranged in a horizontal direction, and the optical characteristics of the first lens array in the vertical direction are different from those of the second lens array in the horizontal direction.

In contrast, the invention claimed in the '368 application allows a stereoscopic image to be observed by providing an image display element that switches between a first synthesized parallax image obtained by alternately arranging stripe images for the left eye and the right eye with a first order and a second synthesized parallax image obtained by alternately arranging stripe images for the left eye and the right eye with a second order which is opposite to the first order, and wherein the light shielding section and aperture section of the mask are changed therebetween in synchronization with the switchover operation between the first synthesized parallax image and the second parallax image. Applicants submit that the invention of Claims 29-31 would not have been obvious from that claimed in the '368 application because Claims 29-31 do not include the features of displaying two synthesized parallax images with stripe images arranged in a different order and switching the aperture and light shielding sections of a mask in synchronization with the switchover between parallax images, and because it would be unnecessary to include such features in the invention of Claims 29-31 because a stereoscopic image is observed in a different manner using that invention.

Accordingly, Applicants request the withdrawal of the provisional double patenting rejection for this reason as well.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that all claims are patentable over the cited art and that this case is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, entry of this Amendment, withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brian L. Klock", is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicants
Brian L. Klock
Registration No. 36,570

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
BLK/mls

DC_MAIN 195946v1